

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8, 13-18, 20-31, 34-49, 51-61 and 64-72 were rejected under 35. U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugzilla (<http://web.archive.org/web/20020202141951/bugzilla.org/about.html> (Feb. 2, 2002)) hereinafter Bugzilla.¹

By this amendment claims 1, 22, 26, 35, 36, 48 and 60 have been amended.² Claims 3, 8, 29, 34, 53 and 54 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 13-18, 20-28, 30-33, 35-49, 51, 52, 55-61 and 64-72 are pending, of which claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to coordinating communication between clients in order to assist in inter-team cooperation for accomplishing a collaborative goal. For example, claim 1 defines analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of client computing systems, wherein the analysis includes determining that a software problem affects a plurality of software products and also affects multiple versions of at least one of the plurality of software products and identifying a different course of steps for each product and for each version of the products with multiple versions, wherein generating the course of steps includes accessing one or more associated time budgets corresponding to the software products and product versions. Next, claim 1 defines determining that a first team of one or more users is responsible for proper implementation of the step, the course of steps including at least a first step for which the first team is determined to be responsible, and a second, subsequent step for which a second, different team is determined to be responsible, the second team including at least one member that is not a member of the first team.

Claim 1 further defines for the first step in the course of steps, presenting to at least a representative user of the first team a first dynamically generated, customized user interface without the user requesting information about the first step, the first user interface providing

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0010], [0044], [0050], [0051], [0053], [0054], [0059] and Figures 2, 4 and 6-8.

customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed, the customized user interface further indicating how the course of steps is progressing relative to the associated time budget. Next, claim 1 defines automatically notifying at least a representative user of the second team the first step has been completed. Lastly, claim 1 defines presenting to at least a representative user of the second team a second dynamically generated, customized user interface, the second user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the second, subsequent step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to an updated current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed.

Claim 22 is a computer program product claim generally corresponding to claim 1. Claim 26 is a method claim similar to claim 1 where the server computing system coordinates communication between clients in order to generate corrective software that resolves a software performance deviation. Claim 48 is a computer program product claim generally corresponding to claim 26. Claim 60 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes functional language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections

Bugzilla describes a defect tracking system (i.e. a bug-tracking system) that allows multiple software developers to keep track of outstanding bugs and track progress on the bug fixes. *Bugzilla* allows a software program such as a computer game to be divided into various components, where each component is overseen by a different programmer. For example, the software program may have a "UI" component, an "API" component, a "sound system" component and others. Components are often divided according to the natural divisions of responsibility among a company or development team (p. 34, pars. 1 & 2). Each component has an owner and, optionally, a quality assurance contact. When new bugs are created or when bugs are changed, the component owner and quality assurance contacts can receive email updates

informing them of the changes. *Bugzilla* further allows configuration of a shadow database which allows users to read a shadow copy of bugs that are being written to (and are thus locked) by other users.

However, while the user can configure the system to send email updates regarding code changes, email updates are very different from a customized user interface that not only lists the next step in a determined course of steps, but also provides the actual user interface for completing the step. *Bugzilla*'s email notifications do not provide such a user interface. Moreover, *Bugzilla* does not provide these emails without the user specifically requesting to receive that information. Furthermore, while *Bugzilla* provides a bug query system (p. 15-16), the bug query system is not configured to identify a course of steps that are to be competed and, more specifically, does not identify a different course of steps for each software product and for different versions of those products. Also, *Bugzilla* does not mention taking time budgets into consideration when generating email updates or answers to bug queries.

Accordingly, for at least any of the above reasons, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest a "server computing system analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of client computing systems, wherein the analysis includes: determining that a software problem affects a plurality of software products and also affects multiple versions of at least one of the plurality of software products and identifying a different course of steps for each product and for each version of the products with multiple versions, wherein generating the course of steps includes accessing one or more associated time budgets corresponding to the software products and product versions," as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.

Furthermore, for at least any of the same reasons, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest "for the first step in the course of steps, an act of the server computing system presenting to at least a representative user of the first team first dynamically generated, customized user interface without the user requesting information about the first step, the first user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic

fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed, the customized user interface further indicating how the course of steps is progressing relative to the associated time budget," as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.

Thus, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 as recited. At least for any of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 22, 26, 48 and 60 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 3, 8, 14, 29, 34-38, 40, 53-54 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 8, 29, 34, 53 and 54 have been cancelled, thus rendering the rejections to these claims moot. Claims 35 and 36 have been amended to properly claim dependency on claim 26. Claims 14, 40 and 56 have not been amended because the claims, as written, include a step that "determin[es] that the second team comprises a plurality of members." Accordingly, because this limitation clearly refines the claim language of the independent claim to include a second team with a plurality of members, Applicants assert that some of the plurality can be notified without notifying all of the plurality. Hence, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 3, 8, 14, 29, 34-38, 40, 53-54 and 56 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 20th day of July, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

2366663_1.DOC